

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

MAY 27 1952

VOL. XII, No. 9

MAY 26, 1952

\$2.00 per year; 10¢ per copy

A Guilty Conscience?

IN a small book published in 1946 under the title *God and the Atom** Ronald Knox sums up his purpose in the phrase: "My thesis is that the use of the bomb is in danger of giving the men and women of the coming age a guilty conscience." As the new and more terrible bombs exploded the other day in Nevada, and the ground troops waited in their fox-holes and then "advanced as planned," that phrase came to mind. Time passes quickly. We are already in the coming age; and one asks what about that guilty conscience?

There is very little sign of it today. The scientists in 1945 were clearly alert to the reality of it. They were concerned, deeply concerned, with the moral values involved in the use of the vast hidden powers they had unloosed. But the moral problem was intricate, difficult. National survival was at stake. The Russians had rejected the admirable Baruch Plan. We are trying, it is true, another approach to the problem of disarmament in the United Nations; but for the moment was it not better to let the moral problem go and prepare for defense? That seems to be the general conclusion today not only of the scientists but of the American public which six years ago was like them deeply concerned with the simple question of right or wrong.

But the trouble is that the question of right or wrong will not, cannot be shelved. The inescapable God is concerned with it whether we are or not. He is concerned with the whole matter of war. He is concerned with the whole matter of the use of weapons that can wipe out a vast city in a moment's time, a city in which most of those who die are completely and utterly innocent. He is concerned with the hideous mushroom growth in Nevada, as He is if there is any place (one does not know) where men are fashioning methods of bacteriological warfare.

But there are other things which He, the inescap-

able God, must see with sorrow in our American world today. Slowly our mindset has been changing. Slowly we seem to have moved from faith in freedom to faith in power. We proclaim that we want peace; we believe honestly, I am sure, that we must build up our defenses in the interest of peace; that NATO is altogether necessary; and it all seems so clear to us that we wonder why anyone should question our motives. But stop a moment! How do more than a hundred air bases scattered about the world look to others? How do our tie-ups with corrupt governments, with dictatorships like Spain and Portugal square with our professions of faith in freedom? How do those Nevada blasts sound in the ears of people who have been subjected for years to the blasts from Moscow of hatred for America; who have been trained to suspicion? Somehow it is hard to have an altogether easy conscience as one thinks of them and then of God. Are we taking the best way?

Nor is one's conscience easier as he realizes that while our own papers and the papers of the world are full of what we are doing with the atom as a means of destruction, there is but a faint word now and again of any progress toward the use of atomic energy to further the development of the arts of peace. Destruction is the note which echoes over the world. It is a very still small voice which heralds anything creative in our work—and that other "still small voice," that mysterious word out of the unseen, again begins to touch our consciences. What does God think about it?

It is quite true that the American people have done much voluntarily to heal the miseries of the world. They went to China as long as they were permitted. They have helped all through the Pacific area. They have given to India. They have backed innumerable organizations in Europe and financed the Marshall Plan. But it is equally true that there seems to be but slight understanding of the kind of help which is really needed in much of the world

* Sheed and Ward. 166 pp. \$2.00.

today. The Friends Service Committee, the representatives of many of the churches, distinguished travelers like Justice Douglas and a host of others plead for understanding upon our part. But the answer is pretty generally, more arms, more defense. We tell the world of the stories of our kind of democracy, but we do nothing to help the people of the Middle East escape from feudalism; we cannot even vote to bring the troubles of Tunisia before the United Nations. Is it any wonder that it looks to the world much as if after all, our professions of faith in freedom and in moral values are lip service—that perhaps our real trust is in force? One cannot help wondering how it looks to the inescapable God.

And then in our specific domestic field we have the endless catalogue of things and events which violate our whole tradition of freedom. From the Smith and McCarran Acts to the network of loyalty oaths, from the antic of a McCarthy to a failure of the churches to speak out on racial discriminations, one reflects upon them and cannot but wonder again and yet again what the inescapable God thinks about it all.

We proclaim that our purpose is peace and freedom, but day after day we read and hear about little but the chance of war. The highest military authorities tell us that in two years we must expect Russia to have reached a peak of preparation for war, probably to be ahead of us in many ways. The Government brushes aside a proposal looking to developing some kind of trade with Russia as propaganda. It refuses passports. It curbs the giving of information. It pleads for UMT. It invites groups (including clergy) to three days at The Pentagon as guests. What kind of mindest is gradually being created? Again one asks, is it altogether wrong to suggest that America is coming to believe that the only thing which really counts is force? The other day the papers carried a scientist's statement concerning the possibility within the next fifty years of establishing a platform "in space," and among the results he enumerated was the fact that the nation which first succeeded in doing this extraordinary thing could rule the world.

One wonders about the inescapable God. What may be His thought? Are we getting our values confused? Is it possible that we favored Americans "with the highest standard of living in the world," with the most marvelous "system of free enterprise," with our bathrooms and our future platforms in space may be laying up for our children the heritage not of a

peaceful and free world, but of a civilization destroyed and a guilty conscience?

This is not a sermon. It is not a criticism of our foreign policy. It is not registering disagreement with the fairly obvious fact that force is necessary in the kind of world in which we live today, if we are to preserve freedom. It is rather a humble questioning of God—it is asking Him (I repeat) whether in our struggle for peace we are emphasizing the things which count most or whether we are laying up for our children the makings of a guilty conscience.—E. L. P.

Editorial Notes

Recently we had an occasion to call attention to and commend the book by Thomas Sugrue, *A Catholic Speaks His Mind*.^{*} We thought the book was spiritually very perceptive and that it was significant to have this kind of criticism of the church by a Catholic layman who was affronted by the desire for political prestige and power of the American church. We suggested at the time that we hoped Mr. Sugrue's fellow Catholics would not take his criticisms amiss. This hope was vain. Mr. Sugrue has made a report of his experiences with Catholic reviewers of his book. The report is a veritable cry of pain. He confesses that he has never experienced so much malice and misinterpretation before. Chiefly the reviewers of his book are interested to prove that he is not a loyal Catholic at all in order to discount his criticism. We must face dismal facts because they reveal how difficult it is for any group—including the church—to accept critical rather than uncritical loyalty.

It is well for Americans to note that things are not going well at the moment with the unification of Europe, particularly the integration of Germany into the Western European community. The Russian offer of German unity and rearmament has done precisely the trick it was intended to do. A divided nation feels its division so keenly that any offer of unity will seem plausible to it. The Russian offer is not really a good one. It does not really protect the nation against the perils of Communist infiltration, but it is plausible enough to appeal to many Germans. These are the kind of hazards which we must expect to face in the long process of unifying and stabilizing the democratic world.—R. N.

^{*} Harper and Brothers. 64 pp. \$1.00.

Looking at Anglo-American Relations*

THE manner in which America and Britain get along together seems to be going through one of its formative phases. We are not openly bickering, but there is a heavy undertow of criticism in Britain, and some over-sensitiveness in the United States about it. I am trying to reflect in this article the seriously minded Britain, the Christian groups who know a bit about the United States (too often east of the Hudson only), and who further are aware that what happens in the United States matters for the whole world. In British politics we have Mr. Bevan and his open anti-Americanism, much of which is born out of a deep distrust of Mr. Churchill and his transatlantic big business friends. We also have a peculiar British brand of "isolationism" which never takes any other country seriously, just as the Londoner is always baffled when he meets someone who really *lives* outside London.

All these attitudes, and indeed every British view of America just now, have a formative background in the frustration that Britain is going through on awakening to find herself no longer a great power in the atomic-era sense. The nineteenth century ended for Britain at Hiroshima, and her world lordship went up in the smoke of Bikini. We do not yet know what our role is to be. We are struggling to keep up a large and respectable estate on a diminished income. But like the editor of *Debrett's* (the blue-book of the British aristocracy) we can no longer record the thousands of acres owned by each landed family, but only its pedigree. Who then is taking our place in the sun of wealth, power and authority? There is only one answer—"It's them Yanks." They have won the War of Independence at last, the final twist to the lion's tail has put the old animal out of action. From now on therefore, we shall feel free to tweak Uncle Sam's coattail, or pull out the eagle's feathers.

In this frustrated condition Britain is more than usually sensitive, and is perhaps over-quick to point charges at America. First of them is *American Imperialism*. Britain of course knows many of the tricks in this trade, but she is ready to admit that America has discovered some new ones. Instead of piling up the imperial acres in the manner of the nineteenth century America scours the world for the basic raw materials, pours in technological dollars in undeveloped areas, and through the world domination of her currency she holds mankind in thrall. There are even miserable cynics in Britain who say that under the cloak of high philanthropy (e.g.

Marshall Aid) America is out to promote Americanism which no one in Britain has ever precisely defined, but concerning which every one who uses the phrase thinks he knows what it means.

Put briefly—Britain divests herself of an empire while America acquires one. This for some Britons is an irritating spectacle to watch, and this partly accounted for the recent criticism of Mr. Dulles and his Japanese Peace Treaty which was seen to be in line with the American global plan. Much of this criticism was misguided and ill-informed, but it is as well to warn American friends that there will be more of it. It is part of the price of imperialism as Britain knows only too well.

A second fear in Britain is the *American Reign of Illiberalism*. Some would call it a "terror," and declare that it has affinities with Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia because the general public in America knows nothing about it. Bertrand Russell has written, "Most of the cases of oppression that occur in America cannot be publicized since any victim who did so would be even more severely victimized. It is only those who have private incomes who can let the world know what they have suffered." He is, of course, referring to the victims of McCarthyism and of the hunts against freedom of opinion on Communism. The facts about "illiberalism" have never, I think, been reported in Britain which accounts for the belief that "illiberalism" is widespread. A word about this from a responsible source in the United States would do a lot to reassure serious opinion in Britain.

To quote Bertrand Russell:

Illiberality in America has reached proportions which are dangerous not only to mankind but even to the United States. Practically every American who has any knowledge of China has become disqualified from giving any assistance to the government by Senator McCarthy's irresponsible accusations. Professors of economics who are told that it is their duty to indoctrinate the young against communism are considered subversive if they know what the doctrines of communism are; only those who have not read Marx are considered competent to combat his doctrines by the policemen who have professors at their mercy. (*Manchester Guardian*, February 27, 1952.)

What truth is there in this?

The precipitate drive against Communism is another ingredient in the undertow of criticism. In some British views the inordinate elevation of Communism into World Bogey No. 1 only sharpens the great divide which now lies across the life of mankind. It is perhaps a matter of tactics rather than of

* This article is being published anonymously but was written by a British churchman well-known to us, and one who is a warm friend of America.

strategy where we think America sometimes slips into errors. This is best illustrated within the Christian field of operations. Almost every piece of world Christian action now has the addendum, "it will help to stave off Communism." In the important field of literacy and literature the incentive to action is the fear of communist propaganda; in schools and colleges we must step up the tempo because leaders against Communism are needed; indeed the whole machine of the church and its world mission appears for America to be geared into the world drive against Communism. The close attention now being given to African and Indian affairs in America, as well as the Far East, suggests, to some here, a fear complex which does not always lead to the right decisions when corporate and co-operative decisions have to be made.

On China, Japan and the Far East the Dulles strategy has been open to misrepresentation in Britain. As Mr. Dulles himself says in a letter to the *London Observer* (March 20, 1952):

I consider that it is of great importance that United Kingdom and United States policy regarding China should be reconciled. Whatever merit there may be in either position is canceled out by the other. The divergence troubles other nations of the Commonwealth; and Asian countries ready to co-operate with both the United Kingdom and United States find it impossible. . . . Surely there is a vast range of possible policies between the one extreme of total abandonment of the loyal representatives of Free China on Formosa and the other extreme of now escorting them to the military reconquest of the mainland. Also I think we need not assume fatalistically that whatever is to happen in China is now immutably foreordained beyond our power to influence.

A footnote on the precipitate drive against Communism, in which Christian forces are expected to take part, deserves notice. In the recent Indian elections the highest communist vote was recorded in Travancore—the most literate and most Christian part of India. Does that fact point to renewed urgency in the campaign against Communism, or does it call for some radical rethinking of Christian action?

Three other factors which muddy the waters of Anglo-American relations may be mentioned more briefly.

There are as many odds in favor of America going to war as there are of Russia. This is not just a piece of pacifist defeatism, but a more sternly realistic view of the vast power potential now within the control of the United States. Looking historically at other accumulations of power they have, so the argument goes, led eventually to armed catastrophe. What solid reasons are there for assuming that the new world will not go the way of the old? It may

be that this view is too jaundiced, and takes no account of the strong forces of freedom and liberalism in the United States. It stems perhaps from within the frustration that afflicts Britain at the moment, a frustration of impotency in a world dominated by two giants. Which of the giants will wield his club first?

What will happen when the tilt of power is in America's favor? This question is allied naturally to the former one, but it is competent on its own account too. It presupposes that in say five years time (granted there is no outbreak of war in that time) that American might will be supreme in world affairs. It is, no doubt, far too conjectural to permit of reasoned answers—and I record it only as evidence of the fear and suspicion which lie in some British hearts. Those who have this fear point to the iniquity of such power in the hands of one nation made up itself of very diverse elements, and capable of such wide sweeps in public opinion. But that the power is, and will be, in American hands gives confidence and hope to many others.

During the next twenty years Britain will be critical of America in almost every direction. As from 1776 onwards America has been critical of Britain, so the roles are now reversed. It will be hard to campaign for an "American view" in this country, and those who do so will be suspect in much the same way as Anglophiles are in the United States.

This attitude will continue until Britain feels sure of herself again, and is marching with firm tread down new avenues of experience which may teach the nations how to live.

Congregational—E. and R. Case Reversed

New York (EPS)—In a 4 to 1 decision, the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of New York reversed a Brooklyn Supreme Court ruling blocking the proposed merger of the Congregational Christian Churches with the Evangelical and Reformed Church. The case was carried to the Appellate Division by the General Council after the former Supreme Court Justice ruled on January 26, 1950, that the General Council had no power or authority, as a representative body, to merge or unite itself with any body or organization. Merger had originally been set for June, 1950.

In the Appellate Division's decision, the majority opinion held: "Ecclesiastical or doctrinal questions may be inquired into only insofar as it may be necessary to do so to determine the civil or property rights of the parties. The civil courts do not interfere with ecclesiastical matters in which temporal rights are not involved. Plaintiffs have failed to establish any right or interest in or to the fund and other assets which plaintiffs asserted were held in trust, which requires or permits a determination of the ecclesiastical issues presented."

American Presidents and Protestant Types

ROBERT E. FITCH*

DOES a man's denominational affiliation have anything to do with his behavior as president of the United States? Most Americans would answer an emphatic "No!" and would even express shock at the very idea.

However, we are getting more realistic these days in our thinking about the relationship between religion and politics in our democracy. The latest book to give us a jog in this direction is James Hastings Nichols' *Democracy and the Churches*. With that should be linked Richard Niebuhr's already classic *Social Sources of Denominationalism*. These writings and others make it clear that, while we observe an institutional separation of church and state in this country, there is still an intimate interaction of persons, of principles, and of cultures.

Right now—with the single omission of Harding—I propose to examine the significance of the denominational affiliations of five presidents since World War I. This gives us: Woodrow Wilson, Presbyterian; Calvin Coolidge, Congregationalist; Herbert Hoover, Quaker; Franklin D. Roosevelt, Episcopalian; and Harry Truman, Baptist. And whatever the reader may think of my main thesis, let him not accuse me of prejudice in favor of my own sect, since I am frankly unhappy about my Congregationalist.

Woodrow Wilson was, I submit, the Calvinist genius at its best: the combination of intellectual discipline with austere moral idealism. He was one of our best instances of the scholar and the preacher in politics. His public discourses had the finely tooled precision and the chaste clarity and the power of a first-rate sermon. He was, moreover, a good Presbyterian in his sense for due process of law—in seeking the lawful occasion to go to war with Germany, in setting up the constitution of a League of Nations to forestall future wars. It was his lofty moral idealism that gave him popular strength, in its appeal to the residual puritan in the American character. But it was the austerity of his ideal plus the austerity of his intellect that finally brought him to failure as a practical politician. Woodrow Wilson, scholar and moralist, always understood right principles. He did not always understand persons.

(In passing let us take note of another good Presbyterian in politics—Norman Thomas, who illustrates the same combination of intellectual discipline and austere moral idealism. This is the man that Wil-

liam Adams Brown used to speak of as the best student he had ever had in systematic theology. Both in Wilson and in Thomas, for all their modernism, there is a core of tough Calvinist literalism which insists that the gospel have concrete embodiment in social institutions.)

If we ignore the tragic interlude under Harding, it might be said that the country was glad to turn from the ardors of Presbyterian discipline to the delights of Congregationalist laissez-faire under Coolidge. If Congregationalist church polity means an extreme emphasis on local autonomy, while the chief executive becomes little more than a spiritual symbol, then Coolidge was its perfect exemplar in the realm of politics. Indeed, one might think of him as a kind of Congregationalist moderator of the U. S. A.—a glorified *roi-fainéant*, famous for his oracular and pithy utterances, and famous also for resolutely refusing to do anything about anything, on principle. If like the British we had wanted a king to give ceremonial expression to our cultural aspirations, then this was our man. But if we were looking for a prime minister, or a president, or an executive of any sort, then we had blundered badly.

Herbert Hoover, the Quaker, was a man of vastly greater stature than his predecessor. But I submit that he illustrates the characteristic Quaker ineptitude in the field of political action. This ineptitude has two sources. For one thing, the genius of the Friends is a genius for working with small groups, where personal and face-to-face relations are primary. In such a group, under religious discipline, there may be a spontaneous feeling of unity in a common purpose, and it is possible, without calling for a vote, to declare the "sense of the meeting." But the conglomerate mass of the American people, except in a great crisis, has no spontaneous sense of unity, and the American congress has no resemblance to a Quaker meeting. The appeal to reason, to piety, and to the inward light is no strategy for the political arena.

In the second place the Quaker is a perfectionist. Once again this is a permissible ideal with the individual and with the small group. It is also permissible, to a degree, in business administration and in the reorganization of government bureaus, to which Hoover brought a kind of secularized perfectionism in the name of "scientific engineering." But it will never do in the field of political action, where one must act imperfectly in the light of incomplete data. The tragic consequence of Hoover's perfectionism as president of the United States is

*Robert E. Fitch is Professor of Christian Ethics at Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, California.

symbolized in the monumental report on *Recent Social Trends* which he initiated. There were only two things wrong with the report. By the time it came out Mr. Hoover was no longer president to act on its findings. By the time it came out, our domestic circumstances had already changed so radically that the findings were outdated and irrelevant. Unlike Calvin Coolidge, Mr. Hoover did wish to act; but, since he was determined on perfection in action, then like Mr. Coolidge he did not act at all.

Wilson, Coolidge, and Hoover all belong to some sort of rationalist pattern. The Calvinist, whether Presbyterian or Congregationalist, and the latter-day Quaker, are pre-eminently men of reason. Let us turn, then, to something more subtle and flexible than reason, namely, intelligence; to something more swift and more decisive than logic, namely, intuition, good judgment, and imagination. This gives us our Episcopalian, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

There are two things to be noted here about F. D. R. First of all he was the Tory Socialist in a grand tradition that went way back to the Anglican mother country. He was the country squire who espoused the cause of the common people against the exploiting capitalists. He combined the aristocrat by birth and breeding and bearing with the true democrat in social action. He was at all times the gentleman, and he was at all times the sincere humanitarian.

In the second place he had a proper Episcopalian contempt for mere logical consistency. He was not the scholar nor the intellectual; he was the leader of men. If his reasons and his principles were not always as precise as they should have been, it is because he moved in the ampler context of tradition, of history, and of destiny. His good judgment may not have always been good, and his imagination may have run away with him at times. But he understood crisis and he understood action, and he thrived on them. Far from being devoted to rational order, he took an Episcopalian delight in juggling incompatibles—in his personal followers, and yet managed to make them work like a team; in his political policies, and yet compelled them to come out to some sort of coherent consequence.

Roosevelt, the Episcopalian, was the people's man, but Harry Truman, the Baptist, is a man *of* the people. There is nothing of the aristocrat in Truman to rise above the solid foundation of his democratic character. Like his own church he is closer to the plain folk of America—both rural and urban—than any of his predecessors in this study. He shares the feelings of the people, he talks the language of the people, and he shows the unexpected strength of the common people in doing battle with the foe, either at home or abroad.

In the one essential—the passion for civil rights and liberties—he is the true heir of Roger Williams. For this principle he will split his own party, and yet win an election. For this principle he will hold stubbornly to freedom of speech and association, even when his veto of restrictive legislation is overwhelmingly over-ridden by Congress, and even when he is warned that to take such a stand will endanger his re-election. On this one point he knows what is right, and he is as wanton in the exercise of a private license of free speech, as he is valiant in the defense of a public privilege of civil liberties.

But what of the rest of his social ethics? In what I say next, I am not forgetting that Rauschenbusch was a Baptist; but he is a more or less solitary figure in the tradition of his church. The fact is that, apart from civil liberties and the separation of church and state, the Baptists have no coherent nor continuous tradition of Christian social ethics. The good Baptist, then, has to turn to secular sources for this part of his program. What Harry Truman found lying around, ready to hand, was the New Deal. And even though he was something of a conservative by temperament, he appropriated this New Deal and adapted it to his own purposes as the Fair Deal. Certainly there is nothing peculiarly Baptist about either Deal. But the Baptist is at liberty to pick up the one or the other if it looks to him like a good deal.

At this point, somewhat abruptly, I choose to terminate the analysis. It is easier to be wise in retrospect than in prospect. But I do find it surprising how true to type in politics may be a good Presbyterian, a good Congregationalist, a good Quaker, a good evangelical Episcopalian, a good Baptist. And it is astonishing that for almost forty years our Presidents have run true to their denominational patterns.

But let no one draw any premature conclusions. There is no guarantee that a Baptist will always be a *good* Baptist, or that an Episcopalian will always be a *good* Episcopalian. Governor Dewey belongs to the same church as did Franklin D. Roosevelt, but I see no resemblance between the political characters and methods of the two men. Furthermore, in these ecumenical times, when the old barriers are falling and the old distinctions are failing, our patterns are apt to be more mixed than pure. Nor does this study provide any conclusive evidence that one denominational type makes a better chief executive than another. Of democracy itself, as of the character of its leaders, let us remember that, while there may be only one spirit, there is room for a great diversity of gifts, and that, as occasions vary, it is in order to alternate these gifts in the position of political pre-eminence.

The World Church: News and Notes

Seek United, Interracial Presbyterian Church in Kenya

Edinburgh (RNS)—Permission to begin negotiations to establish a single Presbyterian Church for members of all races in the East African colony of Kenya has been asked by the Overseas Presbytery of Kenya in a memorandum to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland.

The move was made, the memorandum said, in an attempt to avoid having three groups in Kenya of the Presbyterian order with their main difference "a racial one."

"The unhappy divisions manifest in South Africa," it said, "are here a warning to East Africans who seek to avoid the repetition of a situation where there is a (white) Presbyterian Church of South Africa, a Bantu Presbyterian Church, and an Overseas Presbytery of South Africa which exists only for the sake of missionaries."

"Kenya wishes to set an example of racial cooperation and unity by opening up discussions aiming at one Church with a membership drawn from all races domiciled in East Africa while preserving to Christians of each race their customary forms of worship and administration."

Plan American Church Liaison in Germany

Berlin (RNS)—Appointment of a permanent liaison representative between American and German churches was discussed here by Bishop Otto Dibelius of Berlin, chairman of the Council of the Evangelical Church in Germany, and C. Arild Olsen, associate executive secretary of the Division of Christian Life and Work of the National Council of Churches in the United States.

Such a liaison representative was authorized by the executive board of the Division of Christian Life and Work at its annual meeting last March.

The action was taken following requests from German church leaders for some way of continuing relations between German and American churches after the office of High Commissioner to Germany is dissolved.

The arrangement is expected to become effective when the Religious Affairs Branch of the High Commissioner's Office ceases to function.

North American Assembly on African Affairs Will Be Held at Springfield, Ohio, June 16-25

New York (EPS)—A North American Assembly on African Affairs will be held at Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio, June 16-25, 1952. Governments, industry, academic institutions, philanthropy will be invited to have present selected representatives with knowledge of Africa. Forty or fifty Africans are expected to participate. Missionaries, candidates, mission board members and officers and other church dele-

gates will account for most of the 300 or 350 persons expected.

The Assembly will have two principal objectives. One is to gather and present certain facts and evaluations about the deep and rapid changes taking place in almost all aspects of African life, and to consider the relation of the Christian Gospel to them now and for the future.

The other is to help the North American public see and understand these facts and relations, and likewise to share them after the Assembly with thousands of colleagues, African and foreign, in all parts of Africa, and with colleagues elsewhere.

The call to the Assembly said: "Africa is changing rapidly. Africa's cultural, racial, economic and political changes are of great importance. Mounting tensions and pressures are built up with them. Already some explosions are occurring and more are likely to come."

"International attitudes toward Africa are changing too. Growing group feelings within the United Nations are making themselves felt. The Arab and Asian experiences of the last two or three generations lead them to push for African independence. Some of the colonial powers resist strongly. America and Canada are torn between support of 'European recovery' and support of African aspirations for self-government."

"The spiritual upheaval in Africa is unprecedented. Never has so large and so primitive an animist society been so widely confronted so rapidly by Western Christianity. About 21 million Africans south of the Sahara have accepted Christianity. African Christians probably outnumber the Christians in all other 'non-Christian' countries put together."

"The result of all this is that we are seeing the most massive and inclusive changes, with greater speed, of any ever undergone by 150 million people."

"The outside world still has in greater measure than with any other large area the power to influence, aid and guide Africa's development—provided it acts on the highest moral plane for the highest interests of Africa. It can act thus without fear. For the interests of Africa are entirely compatible with the interests of all the rest of the peace-desiring world."

Episcopal Address at Methodist Quadrennial Emphasizes the Ecumenical Movement

New York (EPS)—Presenting the Episcopal Address of the Bishops of the Methodist Church to the 1952 (Quadrennial Methodist) General Conference (San Francisco, April 23) Bishop Paul B. Kern, Nashville, Tenn., said concerning the ecumenical movement:

"The most significant movement of modern religious history is the growth of the ecumenical Church throughout the world."

"We must be realistic in our ecumenical enthusiasms. There are some Christian bodies which will have no part in it, preferring their own free autonomous fellowships and their separate denominational loyalties. They

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion
537 West 121st St., New York 27, N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *Chairman*

M. SEARLE BATES	LISTON POPE
JOHN C. BENNETT	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
F. ERNEST JOHNSON	AMOS N. WILDER
GLOSTER MONK, <i>Secretary</i>	

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES C. BAKER	HENRY SMITH LEIPER
HENRY SLOANE COFFIN	JOHN A. MACKAY
CHARLES W. GILKEY	FRANCIS P. MILLER
LYNN HAROLD HOUGH	EDWARD L. PARSONS
UMPHREY LEE	

fear the growth of a centralized, authoritarian hierarchy completely destroying the independence and vitality of the member churches. Such procedures would contravene the sense of freedom which is the very genius of Protestantism and defeat the worthy ends for which we struggle.

"There is no conflict between denominational loyalty and adherence to the ecumenical ideal. The best way we can serve the Church Universal is to serve with intelligence and devoted loyalty the Church to which we belong. Unity within denominational groups is the first essential step toward the wider unities within Christendom. Our recent Ecumenical Conference in Oxford brought an exhilarating sense of oneness to the branches of Methodism scattered across the earth.

"This ecumenical movement needs quickly to gravitate from official circles to the local church and the individual member. We are not interested in a spectacular act of ecclesiastic strategy upon a world stage. What deeply concerns us is that this universal movement toward Christian unity should create within the hearts of individual believers and local churches a sense of the supernal grandeur of the Church to which

they belong, and lift their eyes from the round of petty interests and sectarian rivalries to the lofty endeavor of making a whole world Christian. We shall move forward, both at home and abroad, as God gives us strength, to heal the broken body of Christ and unite our forces for the conquest of the powers of darkness."

The Episcopal Address is a review of the life and thought of the Church and its responsibility in contemporaneous life, written by a bishop chosen by ballot by his colleagues. The contents are carefully and critically reviewed by the entire Council of Bishops and are finally presented to the Church bearing the signatures of all the bishops of The Methodist Church.

Dr. Henry Smith Leiper presented the program of the World Council of Churches to the Conference. This is the third quadrennial to which he has given such a report since the Provisional Committee of the World Council was formed in 1938.

Niemoller Explains Why He Declined Moscow Invitation

Germany (EPS)—Kirchenpräsident Martin Niemöller, who was recently invited by Patriarch Alexis, of Russia, to attend the Moscow Conference of all churches and religious association in the U. S. S. R., May 9 to 12, explained in his reply:

"Rarely, in my life, have I found a decision so painful, because on the one hand I do not wish to let slip any opportunity of serving in love and obedience the cause of peace among men, and on the other I have to be equally concerned not to destroy and annihilate by over-zealous action the degree of mutual understanding between men in the East and West which God has long been allowing to grow up, in part also through what I myself have been able to do. In this respect I cannot be sufficiently grateful for my stay in Moscow in January as your guest, for directly afterwards I was able to give an account of my experiences and impressions among Russian Christians to audiences all over the United States, and succeeded in doing so in such a way that distrust became less and trust greater in the common will to peace. I should like to do more in this line wherever opportunity arises. I am most willing and ready to repeat my visit to Russia the moment I see that I may hope for a further increase in confidence in both sides' desire for peace to result therefrom.

"This is the difficulty which now confronts me. It will not have gone unnoticed by you that, while my visit to Moscow met with much approval and little criticism from the American public, it aroused much hostility in Western Germany and all over Western Europe, and for the time being it is my principal concern to combat this hostility, and to demonstrate to people here and in France, and in the other Western countries too, that it is not as a partisan, but as a messenger and worker for the peace of Christ, for service and understanding and forgiveness towards East and West alike, that I am seeking and maintaining contact. It is this that I regard as being, for the moment, my most urgent task, and until I have tackled it and in some degree brought it to a conclusion, a further visit to Russia would do more harm than good."

Detroit Public Library
Book Receiving
5201 Woodward Ave.
Detroit 2, Mich.

650 1-53